

Jannicelli



Comptroller General
of the United States
Washington, D.C. 20548

112625

Decision

Matter of: C-3 Realty Services--Reconsideration
File: B-255818.2
Date: May 2, 1994

DECISION

C-3 Realty Services requests reconsideration of our March 9, 1994, dismissal of its protest alleging that the General Services Administration (GSA) improperly refused to let it submit an offer in response to solicitation for offers No. MTX93415 for the lease of a building to house the Houston District Office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We deny the request for reconsideration because the request provides no basis for reconsidering our prior decision.

We dismissed the protest as untimely under our Bid Protest Regulations, 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(2) (1993), because C-3 Realty Services waited more than 10 working days after becoming aware of its basis for protest to file its protest in our Office. Specifically, C-3 Realty Services had received GSA's letter informing C-3 Realty Services that GSA would not allow the firm to compete for the lease on October 27, 1993, but did not file its protest in our Office until November 23--almost 1 month later.

In its reconsideration request, C-3 Realty Services acknowledges that it was considering protesting upon receipt of GSA's letter on October 27, and asked GSA to send it all the information it needed to protest. The protester states that GSA's response was inadequate and, therefore, blames GSA for its failure to file a timely protest. From this argument, we assume that C-3 Realty Services did not know the timeliness rules that are set forth in our Regulations. However, it has long been our position that since our Regulations are published in the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations, protesters are on constructive notice of their contents. See Applied Sys. Corp--Recon., B-234159.2, Mar. 28, 1989, 89-1 CPD ¶ 319. A protester's professed lack of knowledge of our published Regulations is not a basis for waiving the requirements. Id.

059832/151543

To obtain reconsideration under our Regulations, the requesting party must either show that our prior decision may contain errors of fact or law, or present information not previously considered that warrants reversal or modification of our decision. 4 C.F.R. § 21.12(a). While the protester disagrees with our earlier decision, C-3 Realty Services has not shown that the decision contains factual or legal errors or provided any new information that would warrant reversal. The protester's mere disagreement with our decision does not meet this standard and, therefore, provides no basis for reconsideration. R.E. Scherrer, Inc.--Recon., B-231101.3, Sept. 21, 1988, 88-2 CPD ¶ 274.



John M. Melody
Acting Associate General Counsel